House Counsel's Office, while the company hired a longtime Republican attorney tasked with ensuring the Trump Organization minimizes conflicts of interest.

In interviews, the Trump sons waved off the idea that their plans created any potential ethical problems.

''There are lines that we would never cross, and that's mixing business with anything government,'' Eric Trump said.

Donald Trump Jr. said that since the inauguration, he has spoken with his father twice on the phone and once in person—when he and his brother attended the announcement of their father's Supreme Court nominee, Neil Gorsuch. Eric Trump said he may ask his father how things are in the White House but would never discuss government or business affairs.

''Will we ever talk about tax policy? Will I ever ask for anything that could otherwise benefit the business? Absolutely, emphatically not,'' Eric Trump said. ''He has no need to know what we're doing, and I certainly don't need to know what they're doing, and I don't want to.''

The Trumps' point man on the expansion is Eric Danziger, an experienced executive who was hired in 2015 after previously overseeing expansions at Carlson Hotels Worldwide, Starwood Hotels and the former Wyndham International.

One of the first Scion projects is slated to open in Dallas, where a Turkish-born developer aims to open a sleek glass six-story hotel as part of a $50 million mixed-use downtown development. The Austin, Cincinnati, Denver, Detroit, Nashville, Seattle and St. Louis areas are also possible targets, according to reports by Bloomberg News and business trade publications.

The Trumps declined to say what other cities they were exploring for projects but said they were actively seeking contracts in many places. Danziger, speaking last month to Skift, an industry publication, called Scion a ''four-star lifestyle brand'' with wide geographic appeal.

''That kind of brand can be in every city— tertiary, secondary,'' he said. ''So, how many is that? The opportunity is for hundreds.''

Because of the prohibition on foreign deals, Danziger said the company is ''going to have full focus—instead of some focus—on growth domestically of both Trump and Scion.''

The expansion will not be easy, according to analysts. The Trumps will be entering a crowded marketplace of new hotel lines from Marriott, Hilton and Hyatt designed to appeal to a broad cross-section of customers, said Michael J. Bellisario, a senior research analyst with the firm Robert W. Baird & Co.

''There are so many more competitors out there today,'' Bellisario said.

For the Trumps to distinguish their projects from their competitors, they will need to be choosy about locations, Bellisario said. ''You've got to be on the right street comer in the right market. You can't open these hotels in Topeka, Kansas,'' he said. ''So when you think about that, how big can the new line get?''

The plan is a big test for the younger Trumps.

Just as Donald Trump stepped out from his father's shadow in the 1970s to build the family real estate business into today's worldwide collection of golf courses, hotels, condo towers, branded merchandise and other commercial holdings, now Donald Trump Jr., 39, and Eric Trump, 33, have a chance to make their mark.

Along with their sister, Ivanka, who departed the company when their father entered office, the brothers have long served as executive vice presidents.

Before their father ran for president, the three siblings helped expand the firm from focusing on New York to including the management of luxury hotels in top U.S. cities and seven countries, plus more than a dozen golf courses.

The fruits of that work are still coming, as last month the company opened a new golf club in Dubai and, last week held a grand opening for a new hotel-condominium tower in Vancouver, B.C.

A major transition for the sons is taking over a company in which the force behind every Trump company offering—whether it was selling hotel rooms, office buildings, golf outings, ties or raw steaks—was Donald Trump himself.

In interviews, Trump Jr. and Eric Trump said they consider themselves protectors of the Trump brand, an effort they said is sometimes misunderstood. Critics viewed the announcement of Scion during the campaign as a move away from the Trump name. The family's intent was the opposite; since they view the name Trump has a standard for luxury that ought to be insulated, they will use other brands for less pricey products.

''We would never want to dilute the real estate brand by going into tertiary markets that can't sustain the [luxury] properties as we build them,'' Eric Trump said, ''A lot of hotel companies have gotten this wrong.''

Both sons worked for their father starting at young ages, doing landscaping and other labor on his projects.

A University of Pennsylvania graduate, Trump Jr.'s first assignment at the company was to work with executives at New York City real estate projects.

Eric Trump joined after graduating from Georgetown in 2006. He has overseen the Trump Winery near Charlottesville and worked on the Trump hotel in Las Vegas, where he developed a reputation as a hands-on executive.

''If there's a property tax issue or any litigation, he flies into Las Vegas and takes care of it,'' said Phil Ruffin, a casino mogul who is the Trumps' partner in the Las Vegas project. ''He hires the lawyer. If there are any capital improvements, he approves them. He is very energetic like his father— he will just work night and day.''

With their father in charge, there was an informal division of labor among his three eldest children, governing which projects each swooped in to help.

Ivanka Trump created her own brands of shoes, jewelry, handbags and coats. She took the lead on some of the Trump Organization's mast prominent recent projects, such as the $212 million D.C. hotel, which had its soft opening in September.

''I'm probably the most obviously like [Trump Sr.],'' Ivanka Trump said in a 2011 company video titled ''Trump: The Next Generation.''

''In certain ways,'' she added, ''Eric is very similar to him in terms of his love of construction and building. And Don has his sense of humor.''

The Trumps' planned corporate expansion comes as the president has faced intense criticism from Democrats and ethics experts for his continued ownership interest.

A liberal watchdog organization, Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington (CREW), has sued Trump, arguing that his hotel operations violate a constitutional provision barring the president from accepting gifts or payments from a foreign government. Some Democrats have argued that Trump's international trademarks, including one long-sought registration granted in February by China, also violate the Constitution's emoluments clause.

Trump has called the CREW lawsuit ''totally without merit.''

Amey, of the Project on Government Oversight, said there were ways for the Trumps to avoid potential domestic conflicts related to the hotel expansion. He said they could put the hotel business under another corporate structure, which does not involve a trust directly owned by the president himself.

''There are solutions to solving this, [hut] there doesn't seem to be a will and a desire to do that within the White House,'' Amey said.

The Trump brothers say they are taking ethics concerns seriously and are doing everything necessary to avoid distracting from their father's work as president.

''Have I used him as a sounding board in the past? One hundred percent,'' Trump Jr. said. ''Have I learned a lot from him? Couldn't have had a better mentor. But he's got real stuff he's got to deal with. These are real people's lives . . . . So this notion that he is still running the business from the White House is just insane.''

Trump Jr. scoffed at the idea that his father might have somehow viewed running for president—spending millions of dollars of his own money to run against more than a dozen Republican challengers and Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton when few pundits gave him a chance to win—as a money-making endeavor.

''That's not a get-rich-quick scheme,'' he said. ''That doesn't make any sense whatsoever.''

FLOOR SPEECH ON ANTI-SEMITISM

(Mr. GOTTHEIMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the rising wave of desecration, threats, and harassment targeting Jewish cemeteries, Jewish community centers, and religious institutions in northern New Jersey and across our country.

JCCs and synagogues are bedrocks of religious and civic life for Jewish communities, housing preschools for children and a range of religious, educational, and social programs for families and seniors. Yet the safety and well-being of these communal spaces are the scope of extremism and anti-Semitism.

Recently, there have been eight bomb threats targeting six Jewish community centers in New Jersey and more than 100 across our country. Parents are pulling their children from religious schools. Others are afraid to attend religious services. It is unacceptable.

In the last 24 hours alone, officials in my district have uncovered multiple swastikas defacing our public spaces. These are not cases of random hatred. They are part of a deeply disturbing national trend that requires immediate and decisive action from law enforcement and community leaders at all levels.

As Elie Wiesel said: ''Indifference, after all, is more dangerous than anger or hatred.'' Leaders must stand up now against the rising trend of hate-driven terrorism against any ethnic or religious group, including Jews, Christians, Muslims, and others.

Hate and intolerance have no place in the greatest democracy in the world.

□ 1945

REMEMBERING DOUGLAS SELPH HENRY, JR.

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, Tennessee lost one of its most outstanding citizens, a person who loved Tennessee as deeply, if not more deeply, than anyone. Douglas Selph Henry, Jr., who served in the Tennessee State Senate in the Tennessee State House, served longer than any person ever did in the Tennessee General Assembly—44 years.

Senator Douglas Henry served 24 of those years with me. He was a gentleman, a scholar, a man who said he was a State man, as distinguished from a Federal man, and he was a public man, going to more events in Nashville in his district and for his community than anybody ever has. There was not an event that Douglas Henry wasn't there and helping to fund.

He was a conservative Senator. We had differences on issues many times. But Senator Henry was a man who you could disagree with, and he was never disagreeable. He was truly a gentleman at all times and a credit to his State and a credit to politics and a credit to his family.

He loved his wife, Lolly, who predeceased him, his five children, and his grandchildren. And though we differed on issues and he was pro-life, he cared about children after they were born, passed the mandatory child seatbelt law, and supported all types of education endeavors and endeavors to support mothers and young children. He was just a gentleman's gentleman. I was honored to spend time with him. It is a great loss to Tennessee. My thoughts go out to his family.

REPEAL OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to cover several very, very important points.

Tomorrow is International Women's Day, and I was going to talk about the role of women in our society, talk about my five daughters and what they have been doing in their life of service, and my wife, but events intervened. And yesterday, our good friends on the Republican side introduced a piece of legislation that will dramatically affect women, young and old; children. They introduced a repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

We are still trying to figure out all of the details involved in it. It is going to be a little hard, since it was changed late in the night. But there are some things we do know. I would like to start off with what we do know about the Affordable Care Act so that when we come to debate on the floor in the days ahead the Republican repeal and replacement of the existing Affordable Care Act, we have a foundation.

If you will indulge me, I will try to lay out some facts, not alternative facts, but facts. For example, 20 million Americans have gained coverage as a result of the Affordable Care Act. The percentage of uninsured in America is the lowest it has ever been. Mr. Speaker, 6.1 million young adults between the age of 19 and 25 have gained insurance coverage by being able to stay on their parents' insurance program—6.1 million. Of the Americans who have preexisting conditions, and that is 27 percent of us who have some sort of preexisting condition—heart issues, diabetes, broken legs, bad backs, whatever—27 percent of those Americans are guaranteed coverage even though they have a preexisting condition.

I was insurance commissioner in California for 8 years, and I must tell you the battles—well, it would take several days to talk about the battles that I had with the insurance companies who were denying coverage because of preexisting conditions. No longer the case in America. The Affordable Care Act said no. And by the way, the lifetime limits, they are gone, also.

California, which I have had the pleasure of being a citizen of, 3.7 million Californians are now insured under the Medi-Cal program, and 1.4 million have gained coverage through the exchange, called Covered California. About 1.2 million of those have received subsidies, averaging over $300 a month. Over 5 million Californians will be directly affected by a direct repeal.

And in the expansion of Medicaid, or Medi-Cal as we call it in California, if that is eliminated, that is a $16 billion hit to the State of California, and, obviously, an enormous hit to those 3.7 million Californians who have been covered under the Medi-Cal expansion.

Secondary impacts: employment. Maybe 200,000 jobs would be lost in California.

Individual stories: boy, they abound. Just this evening, I got a call from my wife, and she said: You really ought to talk about that young family in Woodland, California, whose 2-year-old son was diagnosed with some sort of a medical illness. They were able to get coverage before that under the covered California program. They went back a year later, and the kid had a brain tumor.

Fortunately, it was resolved because they had insurance. They were able to get the early diagnosis. And under the current law, the Affordable Care Act, they will be able to keep their coverage, even though previous to the Affordable Care Act, this young child and, quite probably, the family would be uninsurable.

It is working. The Affordable Care Act is working. Are there ways to improve it? Undoubtably, there are, and we could sit down and talk about ways to improve it.

But yesterday, our Republican colleagues introduced legislation that is going to have a profound negative impact on men and women all across this Nation. We will spend time in the days ahead to talk about the details, but we do know that, in general terms, there will be less coverage at a higher cost for literally everybody, except for a few special folks. And I would like to just put up a chart about that. Let's start with this one.

You see, in the repeal bill that was introduced, there are very serious tax cuts. We are talking about hundreds of billions of dollars of tax cuts over the next 2 years. Well, we all want a tax cut. But under the repeal, there are some very special people who are going to get a really big tax cut. Take a look at this.

The top 20 percent of taxpayers will receive 74.2 percent of the multihundred-billion-dollar tax cut, which is estimated to be somewhere in the range of $700 billion to maybe as much as $1 trillion, depending upon the final calculations.

By the way, the Congressional Budget Office has not had time to score, that is to tell us what the cost, what the benefits are, of the Republican proposal. But we do know from earlier studies of this, 75 percent of the multihundred-billion-dollar tax cuts go to the wealthy. Wow. And where does the money come from? It comes from the poor, it comes from the working families, the men and women who are struggling here in America. Maybe they are making a good living—$50,000 to $60,000 a year. They are going to see their benefit package reduced.

One more way to look at this is the famous pie chart. So who gets the tax breaks? Not the top 20 percent. Let's just focus more clearly here on the top one-tenth of 1 percent. What do they get? They are not a percentage. This is not the top 1 percent. This is the top one-tenth of a percent. What do they get? Well, they get nearly $200,000 a year in tax reductions. That is not bad. So the top 1 percent gets 57 percent of that 6-, 7-, $800-billion tax cut, and everyone else will get 43 percent.

So what we have here is a massive shift of wealth from the working men and women of America, from American families, to the very top—you know, the 1 percenters. That is who is getting the benefit in this massive tax cut that has been proposed. I don't know if that is good policy. It is not in my district. I don't think it is good policy for America.

We spent a lot of this last year in the Presidential campaign talking about the shift of wealth to the superwealthy and away from the great majority of Americans. But, here we go. In the very first big legislation of this year, we see the Republicans in a massive effort to increase the wealth of the superwealthy at the expense of the rest of Americans.